



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

TLC

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/787,321	02/27/2004	Kevin Faulkner	6502.0570	4320
60667	7590	03/21/2007	EXAMINER	
SUN MICROSYSTEMS/FINNEGAN, HENDERSON LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			MEHRMANESH, ELMIRA	
		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
		2113		
SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD OF RESPONSE	MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE		
3 MONTHS	03/21/2007	PAPER		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire 6 MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/787,321	FAULKNER ET AL.
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Elmira Mehrmanesh	2113

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 22 December 2006.
 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are pending in the application.
 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
 6) Claim(s) 1-25 is/are rejected.
 7) Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
 Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
 Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____
3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>10/02/06, 11/02/06, 1/08/07</u> .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

This action is in response to an amendment filed on December 22, 2006 for the application of FAULKNER et al., for a "SYSTEMS AND METHODS FOR PERFORMING QUIESCENCE IN A STORAGE VIRTUALIZATION ENVIRONMENT" filed February 27, 2004.

Information disclosed and listed on PTO 1449 has been considered.

Claims 1, 4-12, 14, and 16-25 have been amended.

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 USC § 101.

Claims 14-25 are rejected under 35 USC § 102.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 USC § 103.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

Claims 20-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

In view of Applicant's disclosure, specification [0175], page 81, the medium is not limited to tangible embodiments, instead being defined as including both tangible embodiments (e.g., specification [0175], page 81, floppy disk, CD, DVD) and intangible embodiments (e.g., specification [0175], page 81, via network which implies the use of intangible media such as signals, carrier waves). As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

The factual inquiries set forth in *Graham v. John Deere Co.*, 383 U.S. 1, 148 USPQ 459 (1966), that are applied for establishing a background for determining obviousness under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) are summarized as follows:

1. Determining the scope and contents of the prior art.
2. Ascertaining the differences between the prior art and the claims at issue.
3. Resolving the level of ordinary skill in the pertinent art.
4. Considering objective evidence present in the application indicating obviousness or nonobviousness.

Claims 1-13 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Marks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,775) in view of Bishop et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,539,875).

As per claim 1, Marks discloses a method comprising:
configuring a virtualization layer (Fig. 3) to interface between a host (Fig. 3, element 12) and at least one storage device (Fig. 3, element 40), wherein the virtualization layer defines at least one virtual volume comprising objects defining a

Art Unit: 2113

mapping from the at least one virtual volume to data in the at least one storage device

(Fig. 3) and (col. 6, lines 1-10)

storing information about a state of the at least one storage device in a virtualization database that is distributed across more than one processor in a the virtualization layer (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61)

establishing a state manager for each of the more than one processors, wherein the state manager monitors the state of the at least one storage device (col. 8, lines 42-50) and (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61)

Marks fails to explicitly disclose a quiescence instruction.

Bishop et al. teaches:

issuing a quiescence instruction to the state manager for each of the more than one processors (col. 10, lines 10-14) and responsive to receiving a quiescence instruction by the state manager, halting long lived operations underway at the time the quiescence instruction is received (col. 10, lines 14-43)

and completing short term operations comprising operations that are other than long lived operations and that are underway at the time the quiescence instruction is received (col. 10, lines 14-43).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention to use the method of storage controller failover/failback of storage devices of Marks et al.'s in combination with the storage subsystem recovery of Bishop et al.

One of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention would have been motivated to make the combination because Marks et al. discloses a fault tolerant

Art Unit: 2113

system having storage controller failover and fallback support for increased data availability (col. 2, lines 65-68). Bishop et al. discloses a method of error detection and recovery among storage devices (col. 2, lines 44-49).

As per claim 2, Marks fails to explicitly disclose a quiescence instruction.

Bishop et al. teaches:

issuing the quiescence instruction when a storage device fails (col. 10, lines 10-14).

As per claim 3, Marks fails to explicitly disclose a quiescence instruction.

Bishop et al. teaches:

issuing the quiescence instruction when a processor fails (Fig. 2).

As per claim 4, Marks fails to explicitly disclose a quiescence instruction.

Bishop et al. teaches:

receiving notification from the state managers when short term operations are completed and long lived operations are halted (Fig. 5, element 142).

As per claim 5, Marks fails to explicitly disclose a quiescence instruction.

Bishop et al. teaches:

the short term operations include at least one of: a read operation and a write operation (Figs. 7A-7F).

As per claim 6, Marks discloses the long lived operations include at least one of: rebuilding a virtual volume and scrubbing a virtual volume (col. 7, lines 14-18) and (Fig. 7A, element 106).

As per claim 7, Marks discloses reconfiguring the virtualization layer after the notification has been received from the state managers (col. 7, lines 14-18).

As per claim 8, Marks discloses the configuring further comprises configuring the virtualization layer not to interface with a device that has failed (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 9, Marks discloses a system comprising:
a plurality of storage devices (Fig. 3, element 40) storing data corresponding to a host (Fig. 3, element 12)
a virtualization layer between the host and the plurality of storage devices (Fig. 3, element 40), the virtualization layer comprising objects defining a mapping from at least one virtual volume to data in the plurality of storage devices (Fig. 3) and (col. 6, lines 1-10)
a virtualization database storing information about a state of each of the plurality of storage devices (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61)

Art Unit: 2113

a plurality of processor, each processor having a state manager that monitors the state of at least one of the plurality of storage device corresponding to the processor
(col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61)

Marks fails to explicitly disclose a quiescence instruction.

Bishop et al. teaches:

receives a quiescence instruction (col. 10, lines 10-14), halts long term operations underway at the time the quiescence instruction is received (col. 10, lines 14-43)

in response to a change in the state of one of the plurality of storage devices, and, responsive to receiving the quiescence instruction (col. 10, lines 10-14), completes short term operations comprising operations that are other than long lived operation and that are underway at the time the quiescence instruction is received (col. 10, lines 14-43).

As per claim 10, Marks fails to explicitly disclose a quiescence instruction.

Bishop et al. teaches:

one of the plurality of processors comprises a master processor that issues the quiescence instruction in response to a failure of one of the plurality of storage devices (col. 12, lines 11-18).

As per claim 11, Marks fails to explicitly disclose a quiescence instruction.

Bishop et al. teaches:

Art Unit: 2113

each processor's state manager further notifies the master processor when short term operations are complete and long lived operations are halted (Fig. 5, element 142).

As per claim 12, Marks discloses the master processor further reconfigures the virtualization layer after notification is received from each processor's state manager that short term operations are complete and long lived operations are halted (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 13, Marks discloses the virtualization database is distributed across more than one processor in the virtualization layer (Fig. 4).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

Claims 14-25 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marks et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,790,775).

As per claim 14, Marks discloses a system for dynamically updating storage associated with a host (col. 8, lines 42-50) and (col. 7, lines 14-18) comprising:

means for configuring a virtualization layer (Fig. 3) to interface between a host (Fig. 3, element 12) and at least one storage device (Fig. 3, element 40), wherein the virtualization layer defines at least one virtual volume comprising objects defining a mapping from at least one virtual volume to data in the at least one storage device (Fig. 3) and (col. 6, lines 1-10)

means for storing information about a state of the at least one storage device in a virtualization database means for receiving data about a new state of the at least one storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61)

means for updating the virtualization database with the data about the new state of the storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61)

means for updating the mapping contained in the objects comprising the virtual volume based on the data about the new state of the storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 15, Marks discloses the virtualization database is distributed across more than one processor in the virtualization layer (Fig. 3).

As per claim 16, Marks discloses the updating is responsive to the storage device becoming an available storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 17, Marks discloses the updating is responsive to the storage device becoming an unavailable storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 18, Marks discloses means for reconfiguring the virtualization layer (col. 6, lines 1-10) after the mapping has been updated to form a reconfigured virtualization layer, wherein the reconfigured virtualization layer does not interface with the unavailable storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 19, Marks discloses means for reconfiguring the virtualization layer (col. 6, lines 1-10) after the mapping has been updated to form a reconfigured virtualization layer, wherein the reconfigured virtualization layer interfaces with the available storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 20, Marks discloses a computer-readable medium (Fig. 4, element 46), containing code (Fig. 4, element 54) for directing a processor to perform a method for dynamically updating storage associated with a host (col. 8, lines 42-50) and (col. 7, lines 14-18), the method comprising:

configuring a virtualization layer (Fig. 3) to interface between a host (Fig. 3, element 12) and at least one storage device (Fig. 3, element 40), wherein the virtualization layer defines at least one virtual volume comprising objects defining a mapping from the virtual volume to data in the at least one storage device (Fig. 3)

storing information about a state of the at least one storage device in a virtualization database (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61)
receiving data about a new state of the at least one storage device, updating the virtualization database with the data about the new state of the at least one storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61)
updating the mapping contained in the objects based on the data about the new state of the at least one storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 21, Marks discloses the virtualization database is distributed across more than one processor in the virtualization layer (Fig. 4).

As per claim 22, Marks discloses the updating is responsive to the storage device becoming an available storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 23, Marks discloses the updating is responsive to the storage device becoming an unavailable storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 24, Marks discloses reconfiguring the virtualization layer to form a reconfigured virtualization layer after the mapping has been updated, wherein the

Art Unit: 2113

reconfigured virtualization layer interfaces with the unavailable storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claim 25, Marks discloses reconfiguring the virtualization layer to form a reconfigured virtualization layer after the mapping has been updated, wherein the reconfigured virtualization layer interfaces with the available storage device (col. 7, lines 14-18, 28-30 and col. 10, lines 58-61).

Response to Arguments

Applicant's arguments filed December 22, 2006 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

With regards to the 35 USC § 101 rejections of claims 20-25, Examiner states that applicant's arguments are not persuasive. According to the Interim Guidelines for Examination of Patent Applications for Patent Subject Matter Eligibility, "a carrier wave" as disclosed in the present application's specification (e.g., specification [0175], page 81, via network which implies the use of intangible media such as signals, carrier waves) as a type of a medium is not limited to tangible embodiments. As such, the claim is not limited to statutory subject matter and is therefore non-statutory.

As per claims 14 and 20, in response to applicant's argument that the Marks reference does not disclose a "means for storing information about a state of the at least one storage device in a virtualization database," and "means for storing information about a state of the at least one storage device", Examiner respectfully disagrees.

Marks discloses to support certain high-level storage subsystem functions, such as RAID, the controller 14 presents the entire physical device configuration (from the controller device interface 30 down to the physical device level) to the host CPU 12 as a group of host logical units (LUNs) 40. The host logical unit 40 usually consists of storage data being distributed throughout more than one physical device (as with a RAIDset). The controller presents these logical units to the host as individually addressable, virtual devices (col. 6, lines 1-9). Marks also discloses the user interface configuration manager allows the user to add and remove storage devices (col. 7, lines 14-18) and that devices/storage sets must be initialized prior to use by host (col. 7, lines 28-30). Marks further discloses once the initialization is complete, the host CPU checks the status (*i.e. readiness/availability*) of the storage devices (col. 10, lines 58-61).

As per claims 1 and 9, in response to applicant's argument that the Marks reference does not disclose "storing information about a state of the at least one storage device in a virtualization database" and "monitoring the state of the at least one storage device", Examiner respectfully disagrees. Please refer to the claims 14 and 20 response section. As for the Bishop reference, Examiner notes that Bishop discloses an error monitor and communication logic (Fig. 2, element 74) in each of the storage devices which provides error detection and notification in the storage system and recorded in a queue for further error processing (col. 6, lines 9-36).

In response to applicant's argument that the Bishop reference does not teach "halting long lived operations underway at the time the quiescence instruction is

received, and completing short term operations comprising operations that are other than long lived operations and that are underway at the time the quiescence instruction is received," Examiner respectfully disagrees. Bishop discloses of issuing a quiescence instruction in the event of an error in the storage devices (col. 10, lines 10-14), which will stop the operations. Bishop discloses when a level quiesces it initiates no new commands (*i.e. halt long lived operations*). However, the level may take many more cycles for a current operation to complete (*i.e. completing short term operations*). Current operations will complete only as far as the quiesced level will permit. Therefore, data transferred through the storage system may not be completed. For example, if the traffic cop logic in a set of storage control chips have quiesced data will not go beyond the L2/SC interface (col. 7, lines 57-67). Bishop also discloses traffic cop (Fig. 2, element 60) trace logic maintains a record of the sequence which includes their chronological sequence and the present state of the command (col. 5, lines 56-67 through col. 6, lines 1-8).

Conclusion

THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL. Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the

Art Unit: 2113

shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Elmira Mehrmanesh whose telephone number is (571) 272-5531. The examiner can normally be reached on 9-5 M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Robert W. Beausoliel can be reached on (571) 272-3645. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

